

REMARKS

SUMMARY

Applicant thanks the Examiner's withdrawal of the double patenting and 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9-11, 13-14, 16-20, and 25-29 have been amended.

Claims 30-34 have been withdrawn.

Claims 35-36 have been added.

Accordingly, claims 1-29 and 35-36 are now pending.

Restriction Requirement

In item 2 on page 2 of the above-identified final Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that amendments to claim 14 remove claims 14, 15, and 22 from the restriction requirement. The Examiner maintains, however, that amendments to claim 25 do not fully incorporate the limitation added to claim 14 that removed 14 from the restriction requirement. Thus, claim 25, and dependent claims 26-29, remain subject to the restriction requirement.

In response, Applicant has amended claim 25 to more fully incorporate the "reservation" language which the Examiner notes removes claim 14 from the restriction requirement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25, and dependant claims 26-29, are no longer subject to the restriction requirement, and are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)," on page 2 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1-11, 14-19, and 21-23 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,330,010 to *Nason* (hereinafter "Nason") under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

In response, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the fact that amended claim 1 now recites "A method to be performed on a computer system having a display device including a display surface having a primary display area controllable by an operating system and an overscan area not controlled by the operating system, the method comprising:

reserving a first portion of the operating system controllable primary display area for exclusive use by a first program; and
rendering contents in said reserved first portion of the operating system controllable primary display area, by said first program, excluding all other programs from using said reserved first portion of operating system controllable primary display area.

In contrast, Nason merely teaches a “method for creating and accessing a graphical user interface in the overscan area outside the area of the display normally utilized by the common operating systems.” The overscan area taught by Nason is a border around the primary display area and is not controlled by the operating system.

Thus, Nason and the present invention teach away from each other.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Nason.

Claims 14 and 16 are independent claims having similar recitations as those recited in claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 14 and 16 are patentable over Nason.

Claims 21-23 include similar language directed to apparatuses of the invention. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 21-23 are patentable over Nason.

Claims 2-11, 15, and 17-19 depend from claims 1, 14, and 16, incorporating their recitations respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-11, 15, and 17-19 are patentable over Nason.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” on page 5 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 12-13, 20, and 24 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Nason in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,583,793 to *Gould* (hereinafter “Gould”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a).

GOULD fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Nason. Therefore, claims 1 and 20 remain patentable over Nason even when combined with GOULD.

Claims 12-13, 20, and 24 depend from claims 1 and 20, incorporating their recitations respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 12-13, 20, and 24 are patentable over Nason in view of Gould

New Claims

New claims 35-36 contain in substance the same recitations earlier discussed with respect to claim 1. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 35-36 are patentable over the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all pending claims, claims 1-29 and 35-36, are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: October 18, 2005

by:



Robert C. Peck
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981